5/18/75

Mr. Roger Feinman
CBS News-Radio
524 W. 57 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10019

Dear Roger,

An expected guest makes an immediate task impossible, I don't feel like doing bits of work needing doing, so I attempt a dialogue over the views in your 5/15.

In doing this I of course presume the honesty with which you hold views I disagree with. What I can hope for is not changing your views but a better understanding of what leads you to them. This can be helpful to me, to what I seek and to my ability to be of value to the media.

You believe that the spectro ought be a special report rather than an item on the Evening News.

And that it is necessary to "create a preponderance of the evidence instead of letting it come out piece by piece."

(With regard to the medical evidence I agree entirely but for different reasons.)

I see no conflict between a spot item on the spectro suit, perhaps more than one, and as definitive a treatment as is possible in a special report.

The "preponderance" of evidence exists. What does not is media willingness to consider it if not indeed conceive that it can or does exist. By now you, for example, should be aware that there is this established and definitive preponderance. But those above you, who have their own and different responsibilities and obligations, have no way of which I know of being aware of what is established, is fact.

There is no way of which I know by which these executives can become aware of the factual realities unless they are "out piece by piece." They probably do take in their own news and do trsut their own newspeople.

Likewise others of influence more than the people have a piece by piece need. The people in general are far ahead in their understanding.

Call it The Establishment, The Power Structure or what you will, those who are least informed, least easily informed and most influential in national life are the very ones who need a piece by piece treatment. Without it they will be overwhelmed and unwilling to believe. That part of the full truth that I have established beyond reasonable questioning actually is this Byzantine. It actually does bolt all the idols with lightening.

The leaders of all societies all underestimate ordinary people. My contact with the average person is exceptionally great for a number of reasons, including that I have the only books available and they can be obtained from me only. (I have preserved every letter I have received, from something over 3,000 strangers, for social scientists of the future.)

My contact with those in leadership positions of various kinds, political leaders, editors (electronic, printed press, magazine and book), people of wealth and influence, with the exception of book editors only, are consistent in underestimating popular understanding and opinion and imagining non-existent problems - especially a non-existant danger to the national fibre.

The Warren Commission and now Rockefeller's (Ford's) were well aware of the need for conditioning. In context, piece by piece. They were careful to leak the prejudicial and unfactual over a period of time to create a climate which would make the unacceptable acceptable. To make falsehood appear to be truth. Hoover was a leader in this with the JFK assassination and King's.

It is precisely because the actualities are so Byzantine that gradual exposure to it is necessary.

With the spectro/NAA tests, what is not legitimately newsworthy and not really the obligation of an unfettered press is telling and giving the proof of a few basic truths: there was deliberate official fakery, especially by the FBI; the required tests were never made, by the FBI or demanded by the Commission; the required results,

according to the FBI, were never compiled, the real purposes of these tests.

Remember, the subject is the assassination of a President and what that means, including the subversion of the entire political process.

Each of these is a simple and easily understood fact, subject to individual or collective treatment in very few words (also a few pictures I have, all official).

Ought each not be reported?

If the press is free and not a creature of branch of government, does it not have the obligation to report each once it learns and is satisfied on factuality?

I see neither conflict nor competitiveness when these simple facts can be reported and when there can be a more definitive treatment of the entire story. (We are in court again Wednesday 5/21. To date the government has not responded to our interrogatories, which means they are trying to make response and analysis impossible. Anticipating this I have asked my lawyer to make a formal request of the U.S.Attorney that we have the response in time for examination, study and responsible addressing in court - with the alternative a request of the court for time to do this plus requiring timely rather than deliberately delayed responses in the future.)

When I have everything the government is going to let me have will be time for what for the emdia is in-depth treatment. But until then life goes on, news is made and reported, people are informed, and representative society has a chance to function. (On the popular and Congressional levels.)

Without reporting of the legitimately newsworthy when it becomes news and not as history, can representative society really work?

As a different kind of illustration let me use the 1/22/64 Executive Session transcript. Obtaining it required some effort. It was given away freely, prior to and on 4/25/75, when there were 30-40 reporters present. By normal standards it is solid news. Experienced, responsible reporters discussed it with me, on many occasions. There is no useful purpose to be served in naming names but the most influential of papers had copies. No part of the major media touched this story until AP put a decent and fair story on the wire yesterday afternoon. Among those papers not using it of which I know or have been told are the NYTimes, the WxPost and the WxStar. With these papers my minimum approach was twice. I do not know what the use or treatment are but I do know that papers from Newsday to the LATimes asked questions of AP, which asked me.

All I know is what appeared in today's Baltimore Sun. That by any standards is a significant story, yet these major stories ignored it. That really means suppression.

This si a good story, but it does not and cannot begin to report the significant news in those 13 pages. Even when what is not included is tipical today because it is properly part of several Congressional investigations. Perhaps the rest never will be reported.

Without piece by piece reporting news and fact of this kind can never be handled in any way by the mass media and the majority of the people then will have no way of knowing what they need to know if our kind of society is to be able to function.

One of the things that separates and distinguishes my work from that of all others writing in the field is that I focus on the functioning of society and its institutions while telling the factual story as I uncover and authenticate it. Well, one of these institutions is the press. I do not regard it as entertainment in any form and where it has become entertainment - with which there is nothing wrong - it is a relatively new concept and is not part of the basic reason and need for the press.

I expect this whole miserable mess to come apart. The only questions I now entertain is when and how. I can influence these determinations only slightly, more and responsibly with traditional and accepted performance by the press. Unless this is done one of the real probabilities is another whitewash. That alone is the possibility of a new national trauma. If there is this new covering up it will be the direct responsibility of the press, which will have made it possible by what I regard as abdication of nroms, practises and traditions - by continuing to regard this as a different, perhaps a non-news item. Plesae argue. Best,